IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

THURSDAY, THE 12TH JULY 2007 / 21ST ASHADHA 1929

WP(C).No. 21486 of 2007(G)

PETITIONER:

SATHEESAN, AGED 52 YEARS,
S/O. CHAKRAPANI, KURUPPASSERY HOUSE, PULLAT,
THRISSUR DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.V.M.KRISHNAKUMAR
SMT.P.A.ANITHA

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. DIRECTOR OF FISHERIES,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF FISHERIES, THRISSUR.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. I.V. PRAMOD

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 12/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

S. SIRI JAGAN, J.

W.P.(C)NO.21486 OF 2007

DATED THIS THE 12th DAY OF JULY, 2007

JUDGMENT

In co-operation with the National Fishermen Welfare Fund, the State Government has framed a scheme for providing financial aid for construction of houses and repair of houses, which were damaged due to flood in coastal area. As per the scheme, 90% of the available houses would be allotted by drawing lots from the applicants. Balance 10% of the houses were to be given to the most needy persons. As per the original scheme, persons constituting 10% discretionary quota were to be recommended by a beneficiary committee constituted for that purpose. The Government has now decided to dispense with that procedure and to take it upon itself the task of choosing the persons under 10% discretionary quota also. This is challenged by the petitioner, who claims to be the member of the beneficiary committee. The petitioner submits that the beneficiary committee is more competent to do the selection than the Government, and that no guide lines have been prescribed for the selection.

I I am not inclined to accept the contentions of the petitioner. The beneficiary committee consists of people from the locality. When the Government constituted the committee under powers vested with

them, the Government can also legally dispense with that procedure and take it upon itself to decide the 10% quota also. Therefore, I do not find any merit in the writ petition and accordingly, the same is dismissed.

S. SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE

Acd